

REMARKS

In the January 18, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-10 were pending in the application and were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0034737 to Cane et al. (Reference A in the December 18, 2003 Office Action) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0220899 to Barney et al. (Reference A in the January 18, 2005 Office Action). Claims 1-10 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Newly Cited Prior Art: U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0220899 to Barney et al.

Barney '899 is directed to file management of backup data stored on removable storage media. Barney '899 is a continuation of an application filed January 22, 2001 which issued as U.S. Patent 6,751,604. Barney '604 was a continuation-in-part of an application filed January 6, 1999 which issued as U.S. Patent 6,212,512. Since the subject application was filed January 17, 2001, only the portion of Barney '899 disclosed in Barney '512 could be prior art. It is suggested that if any of the Barney patents and patent application publication continue to be used in rejecting the claims, that Barney '512 be used, so that what is relied on as prior art is clear.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a)

As noted above, Barney '899 like Cane et al. is directed to a backup system. In addition, Cane et al. discloses storing a copy of a file on a mirror server, while Barney '899 also describes a user interface within a file system. On the other hand, the independent claims have been amended to recite "simultaneously saving original files for a website to a working directory and a public directory" (e.g., claim 1, lines 1-2). The January 18, 2005 Office Action acknowledged that "Cane et al. does not teach ... [responding] to a request from a user to save multiple copies of the single original file" (Office Action, page 2, lines 18-20). In the following lines on page 2, Barney '899 was cited as disclosing a user interface to save multiple copies of a file. However, nothing has been cited or found in either reference that in response to the request from a user, "a plurality of saving destinations [are designated], including the working directory and the public directory, in which ... [the] single original file should be saved" (e.g., claim 1, lines 3-4). Furthermore, there is no suggestion that "a completed original file [is] saved in both the working and the public directory to publicize only the completed original file" (e.g., claim 1, last two lines).

Since similar limitations are recited in the other independent claims, it is submitted that claims 1, 9 and 10 patentably distinguish over Cane et al. in view of Barney '899 for the reasons

discussed above. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and therefore, claims 2-8 patentably distinguish over Cane et al. and Barney et al. for at least the reasons discussed above.

Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-10 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Entry of the Amendment, reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 5/18/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501